

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1-12 are amended in this paper. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at paragraph [0073].

No new matter has been introduced. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

The Abstract of this Application is amended.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0033844 to Levy et al. (hereinafter, merely “Levy”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“... the plurality of module data and data included in the module data all being KLV data.” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Levy relates to a method of connecting multimedia content to a network resource. The method extracts an identifier from a media signal and sends the identifier to a network.

Applicants respectfully submit that Levy fails to disclose or suggest the above identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing is found that teaches or discloses the plurality of module data and data included in the module data all being KLV data, as recited in claim 1.

Indeed, claim 1 recites detecting identifier data from KLV data. However, Levy detects identifier from watermark blended in the signal. Applicants submit that utilizing the KLV data, as recited in claim 1, is in direct contrast to detecting an identifier from a watermark blended in the signal, as described in Levy.

Therefore, for at least the above discussed reasons, claim 1 is patentable.

Since claims 6 and 8-12 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to claim 1, claims 6 and 8-12 are patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Since the other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, they are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken

as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800